DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 665 HE 015 168

AUTHOR Hickerson, J. Douglas
TITLE General Education: A New Force in Student Development.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; *Educational Philosophy; *General Education; Higher Education; *Humanistic Education; *Humanities; Individual Development; Liberal Arts; Self Actualization; *Student Development; Theories

ABSTRACT

Student development philosophy, based solely on the behavioral sciences and a romantic humanistic philosophy, is not adequate for meeting human needs in contemporary society. The concepts of holism, humanism, pragmatism, and individualism are all part of this student development philosophy but have been distorted. The literature on student development reflects these distortions. General education, emphasizing the humanities in the curriculum, provides the needed perspective and substance that the philosophy currently lacks. It provides an enlightened form of humanism, in which self-fulfillment is part of human fulfillment. The general education curriculum provides the competencies that satisfy the essential human need for meaning in nature and knowledge: creating, discovering, enjoying, perceiving, and acting. The elements in the curriculum that provide these competencies are language, mathematics, science, arts, personal relations, morals, history, religion, and philosophy. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216665

GENERAL EDUCATION:

A New Force in Student Development

J. Douglas Hickerson

Assistant Vice President for
Student Affairs

S.U.N.Y. College at Brockport

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Douglas Hickerson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 015 168

PART I.

THE FAILINGS OF OUR "STUDENT DEVELOPMENT" PHILOSOPHY

The student development profession bases its identity on a philosophy and theory of student development. The terms "philosophy" and "theory" are often used interchangeably, but it is more appropriate to distinguish the two. Our philosophy of student development is really an attitude toward students and an assertion about their nature, their worth and the ultimate realities of how they grow. Holism, humanism, pragmatism, and individualism are cited by Saddlemire as four philosophical ideas most influencing our profession.[1]

Student development theory, compared to philosophy, is more of a description of the growth process, based on empirical evidence of the social sciences. Such theory tends to inform our philosophy of student development as well as provide a practical basis for planning effective programs and services. Saddlemire points to the early 1960's and the influence of such behavioral scientists as Keniston, Heath, Katz, Clark and Trow on our profession. He illustrates the relationship of theory to philosophy by referring to Nevitt Sanford as "one influential theorist who helped move student services staff from a 'service' approach to a developmental approach." Saddlemire refers to several of Sanford's works as important resources to help student services staff "modify their own philosophical positions". . .[2]

I will demonstrate three basic points: 1) Our student development philosophy, based solely on the behavioral sciences and a romantic humanistic philosophy, is not fully adequate for meeting human needs in contemporary society; 2) General Education, emphasizing the humanities in the curriculum, provides the needed perspective and substance that our philosophy lacks; and 3) the State University of New York College at Brockport provides an example of some basic ways in which the student affairs division and faculty can collaborate in establishing a General Education Program.

Our student development philosophy has never been thoroughly articulated. The most significant statements are the ACE "Student Personnel Point of View" as set forth in 1937, Williamson's reaffirmation and expansion of this point of view in 1949, and COSPA document issued in 1975 entitled, "Student Development Services in Post-Secondary Education." From these brief position statements and the journal articles and books expanding on them, I think Saddlemire is

quite accurate in summing up the most basic ideas in our philosophy as a combination of holism, humanism, pragmatism, and individualism.[3] I think our philosophy of student development has deficiencies or distortions in its espousal of these basic ideas.

HOLISM

The holistic approach that we profess in our view of students is somewhat hypocritical. In writing, our best spokesmen say that intellectual and cognitive development must be integrated with the affective domain of personal growth. The underlying attitude, however, is to criticize faculty narrowness, or most generally, to act "holier than thou" and wish that faculty could see the rightness of our position. (See, especially, Hazen Foundation Report, 1968.)

Within our own camp I think it is counter-productive to profess a holistic approach to students and then claim for our profession the title "student development specialists" as the COSPA statement does. If we are the student development specialists, that seems to make the faculty member a second-class or uninitiated citizen. A significant position in the COSPA statement is that, "In general, the faculty tend to emphasize content, and the student development specialists tend to emphasize process."[4] The statement contributes to a bifurcation of roles.

Saddlemire makes a very significant observation about the COSPA statement: "Moreover, the philosophical assumption of this paper assumes that human beings seek to become free and self-directed through the developmental process (my italics) and that the student development specialist helps students reach these life goals."[5] It seems that we are very much preoccupied with process to the exclusion of content--again a sign of our hypocrisy if our end is to be holistic. Our disavowal of content is usually in terms of being "value free." Perhaps the most significant example of process vs. content position is found in the "Values Clarification" method that seems to be among the most frequently cited of our student development techniques. I refer you to Richard L. Morrill's book, Teaching Values in College, for a thorough and profound examination of values learning. Morrill points to the inconsistencies and inadequacies of the values clarification claim to being a neutral valuing process. A primary criticism by Morrill is that, "The method emphasizes the psychology of personal choice and growth, which it confounds with the nature of values themselves."[6] The point Morrill makes for us is that, in any of our student development techniques,

the concern with process to the exclusion of content is a denial of our concern for the student as a "whole person."

In another theoretical area, I think our preoccupation with the growth "process" has led to narrow definitions of roles and methods; consequently, we deny our holistic approach to students. We concentrate on the trees and lose sight of the forest. I am speaking in particular of the Miller and Prince book, The Future of Student Affairs. The authors place great emphasis on the process model of student personality and growth. They add to the ACE (1937) principles, that, "human development is a continuous and cumulative process of physical, psychological, and social growth which can be divided into an orderly series of life states."[7] Notice, intellectual growth is excluded. As a profession, "our task is helping students acquire the skills and knowledge they need in order to change."[8] The authors center on an assessment process as the means of facilitating the change. In the chapter on "Assessing Individual Growth," we are presented with the following tedious process: "1) student's needs are diagnosed; 2) goals are determined; 3) the student's current level of achievement... is specified...; 4) the strategies needed to achieve the desired goals are outlined; 5) the student's performance is continuously assessed; and 6) movement toward or attainment of goals is evaluated."[9]

In a further narrowing of the "student development specialist" role proposed by ACE (see above), Miller and Prince see this assessment done by the "assessment practitioner" who is "primarily a technician who collects, processes and interprets data."[10] The authors are not clear whether we are all to become technicians in this model, but it is implied that we will. In practical and philosophical terms the scope of the student development profession can never be narrowed to the assessment practioner role.

HUMANISM

Humanism is actually of two basic varieties. One variety which I call romantic individualism sees each human being as a unique source of ultimate human worth and meaning; the natural instincts of each person will define who he is and who he will become. Left to these instincts each human being is innately good. Another variety of humanism I call enlightened humanism. This humanism says that we cannot understand the real nature of a human being--his highest or lowest qualities--without understanding mankind as a community and a

race. A human being can understand himself only in relation to others past and present; his capacity for feelings, ideas, compassion, creativity, and motivation is dependent on exposure to these human qualities in the cultural heritage of the past and the expression of them in the contemporary culture. In the romantic version of humanism, authentic and satisfying existence is dependent solely on what the person finds within himself. In the enlightened version, authentic and satisfying existence is dependent upon knowing one's place in the stream of mankind by reflective and aesthetic awareness made relevant to the present. Our profession has adopted the romantic brand of humanism.

Jacques Rousseau is most famous for this philosophy of romantic individualism which sees each person as intrinsically good and self-defining; it is the structure of society that would inhibit this "natural man" and therefore it is society that tends to be evil. Romantic humanism has been dominant in our student development philosophy through Dewey's influence and more recently in the Human Potential Movement. Kilpatrick reminds us that, starting with the Humanistic Psychology of Maslow and Rogers, the Human Potential Movement over the past thirty years has reached into such areas as religion, business, education, the arts, marriage "and that most amorphous category called life-styles."[11] In the home, school, church and business, the common terms are "child-centered", "facilitators", "nondirective", people "actualizing" themselves, and "self-concept".

It is the Human Potential Movement which established the human psyche as one of process rather than substance. We return to that idea of "process" again because we are here considering the very basis of our human nature. Rogers asserts, "At its best, life is a flowing, changing process in which nothing is fixed."[12] Kilpatrick explains Rogers' ideal of health as consisting of "flowing with this stream, being whatever thoughts and feelings are flowing through one now, and recognizing that these will be constantly changing."[13] Rogers' is essentially an organic model of human nature; human nature being self-enhancing and self-actualizing in an automatically unfolding process. This essential determinism is evident in his frequent use of the word "organism". Volition, for Rogers then, ends up as "simply the subjective following of a harmonious balance of organismic direction."[14] The pervasive influence of Rogers' thought is very much with us as we have seen in the Miller and Prince book. On the point of process being the very nature of reality, the Miller-Prince book begins with the sentence, "No doubt the statement that 'nothing is permanent but change itself' seems trite

these days, but trite sayings often achieve that status because they are basically true."[15] The first chapter includes the statement, "This change, then, represents the basic unit of human development,"[16] and it ends with the statement, "...all things do change in time and the survivors are those that anticipate, respond to, and flow with that change."[17]

The problem with this organic model of humanism is its concept of volition and the idea of self-fulfillment. Human will and choice are dissipated in a process where one simply becomes "aware" of one's self. The fault in this Rousseau-ian philosophy turned into psychology is stated by Kilpatrick,

> If the self is understood as an automatically unfolding process, however, there is little incentive to create it, or to define it one way rather than another. The emphasis shifts instead of experiencing it in all its flux and flow. Choices yield to sensation. Getting in touch with one's feelings is somehow supposed to solve the problem of choice.[18]

The most critical point in Kilpatrick's book indirectly sends out an alert to our profession to reexamine the brand of humanism we espouse. He says, "The trouble with this (Human Potential) view is that self-actualization becomes an end in itself, becomes, in fact, the ultimate purpose." He goes on to quote Victor Frankl's observation that it is contradictory to make self-actualization the ultimate purpose:

> A concept such as self-actualization, or self-realization, is not a sufficient ground for a motivational theory. This is mainly due to the fact that self-actualization, like power and pleasure, also belongs to that class of phenomena which can only be obtained as a side effect and are thwarted precisely to the degree to which they are made a matter of direct intention. Self-actualization is a good thing; however, I maintain that man can only actualize himself to the extent to which he fulfills meaning. Then self-actualization occurs spontaneously; it is contravened when it is made an end in itself.[19]

For the purpose of this paper, I will leave this critique of our brand of humanism which we have in the student development philosophy. It has already introduced us to the discussion of <u>individualism</u>, the fourth but related philosophy which Saddlemire cites as a component of our student development philosophy. I accept the philosophy of individualism which asserts the infinite worth of the individual human being and the necessity of each person making his or her very own decisions in life. I believe that this legitimate idea has seen or is seeing serious distortions in our society as evidenced in the now defunct counterculture, in the sybaritic popular culture characterized by Christopher Lasch as "Narcissistic", and the appearance of various form of fanaticism. I don't fault our profession or

higher education as contributing to these distortions of individualism, but we might subtly be doing so. Our student development philosophy was established primarily because of the dehumanized forms of rigid structures that the youth culture of the 1960's found in the government, business, and higher education, including our "student personnel" approach. It would be ironic if we are now innocently aiding and abetting the pendulum's swing to extreme forms of human liberation and individualism. Robert D. Brown in his 1972 monograph seemed to offer sympathy for student individualism, the consequences of which he could not really foresee. He projected "the continuance of the counterculture" and "the promise of more individualism among students", including the increasing pervasiveness of "doing your own thing" in student life.[20] It is fortunate that this benign projection has proven basically inaccurate, as we will see in an article by Max Raines.

PRAGMATISM

The pragmatism in our student development philosophy is really a theory of how the student learns and grows. It is based on John Dewey's progressive educational theories. Dewey was a naturalistic humanist in that he was greatly influenced by Darwin's theory of evolution; he saw man as continuous with nature and continually experiencing growth in an organic process in which the individual is encountering responding to its environment. Perhaps Dewey's thought is the root of our premise that the individual is an organism in process. In a statement that reiterates my earlier observations on concern for process and disdain for content, Dewey argues,

> Since education is not a means to living, but is living a life which is fruitful and inherently significant, the only ultimate value which can be set up is just the process of living itself. And this is not an end to which studies and activities are subordinate means; it is the whole of which they are the ingredients.[21]

And elsewhere, Dewey writes, "Growth itself is the only moral 'end'."[22]

Another key word in Dewey's educational theory is environment. As the precursor of our current concern for "milieau management", Dewey first emphasized the need to create the kind of environment in which the desired growth and development would take place. In fact, the whole range of "life skills" we offer in our student development programs (i.e., assertiveness training, decision making, human relations, career planning) are those which we feel will

equip the student to learn by doing in his lifelong process of growth.

I think the most provocative exponent of Dewey's pragmatic learning theory is Max Raines in a 1977 journal article entitled, "A Life-Centered Student Affairs Program."[23] This article is very informative and penetrating in its analysis of the history of our student development philosophy. Starting with the earliest colleges, Dr. Raines shows how the institutions' attitude toward the student changed in accord with changes in the values and mores of society. The earliest colleges had a cosmothetic approach to students, stressing the importance of "cosmic truths and virtues." In the latter part of the 19th century the focus was nomothetic stemming more from the needs, expectations, and norms of a more developed society. Following World War II there was a mental health emphasis and the influence of mental therapeutic psychologies from Rogers, Horney, Fromm, Maslow and Ellis. This influence introduced a life adjustment perspective toward students, still part of the nomothetic approach to "fitting in." Raines concludes this historical progression with the observation, "It was not until the rebellious sixties that humanistic thinking acquired its fullest commitment to the idiographic viewpoint."[24] Providing a concise summary of observations on romantic humanism earlier in this paper, Raines shows how the 1960's precipitated our current student development philosophy, especially its "individualism":

> Reacting to the heavy domination of a nomothetic view of student relationships, the idiographic response expressed categorical contempt for societal expectations. In this revolutionary context it maintained that individuals are essentially good and beautiful, needing only to be facilitated in self-expression. This idiographic view provided the initial impetus to the student development movement and to some extent accounts for the continuing resistance among those who identify with the nomothetic perspective.[25]

Our reference to Raines' article, however, is to show how it proposes to make Dewey's pragmatism the more dominant mode in our student development philosophy. While our endeavors should remain humanistic, Raines would make romantic individualism subordinate to a transactive approach. Instead of simply facilitating the expression of the students' subjective desires, there is a recognition of the real world out there to which the student must have adequate responses throughout life. The process of transaction "emphasizes that the human organism carries with it a set of experiences and expectations which conditions any interactive experience and thus modifies the experience accordingly. Thus the subject becomes entwined with the object and vice versa."[26]

I understand this to mean that, when the person (subject) encounters the environment (object), the experience is whatever the person makes of it. What he

makes of any one experience can be "extracted" into "transactive concepts which will serve us well in subsequent experiences and which can add meaning to our lives"[27] (my italics). In pure Dewian form, Raines has proposed the problem-solving technique of adapting to the environment. Going back to the Darwinian terms, those fittest to survive the process of lifelong change will be those with the best transactive concepts. Raines uses "transactive concepts" interchangeably with "principles". These are not principles in the moral or spiritual sense but empirically based theories for action. It is difficult to see how these "principles" can add "meaning to our lives". It does not matter, however; it appears that we are not speaking of meaning to any existential depth. In this view we don't need meaning to life as such but a "transactional competency" to cope with living. And what kind of life situations might we apply it to? Raines offers as examples: "adapting to new environments, managing self-directed learning projects, becoming financially independent, establishing and maintaining optimal physical conditioning, managing one's progress in a career, responding to the energy crisis."[28] In a society in which the most basic mores and beliefs about human identity, relationships, responsibilities, and community are shaking, this list of life's apparent most significant situations seems trite--reading like chapters in a sybarites' guide to positive thinking. The pragmatism in Raines' life-centered education does not lend depth or legitimacy to our philosophy of student development.

SUMMARY: The holism we profess in our approach to students is contradicted by our preoccupation with student growth as a process and our indifference toward (our "neutrality" about) the nature and origin of the content of the student's mind. We state an ideal about the integration of intellectual pursuits in student development and an ideal about collaboration with faculty, but too much of our literature accuses academia of narrowness and asserts the rightness of our cause. Another betrayal of holism is that we have relied solely on the social sciences and some of our spokesmen would render us technologists assessing the growth process.

Our humanism is the romantic variety which emphasizes the innate goodness and potential of the individual evolving in an organic process. Our professional role, then, is to be facilitators of the self-directing, self-actualizing process. Self-actualization becomes an end in itself. No provision is made for man's ultimate need to find meaning, nor for the importance of motivation and commitment

that shape one's life. Carried to its extreme form, romantic humanism in our culture has become a distorted form of individualism creating a popular culture of "me-ism" or narcissism.

The pragmatism in our current student development philosophy originates in John Dewey's educational theory. Dewey's theory emphasizes the human as an organism responding to the environment and adapting through a problem-solving cognitive process. Reviving Dewey's pragmatism in a "life-centered" approach to student services does correct the extremes of individualism or what is called the "idiographic" approach. This proposed "transactive" approach to student development merely provides principles for practical coping with change in life and avoids the meaning and commitment that are ultimately needed for human fulfillment.

PART II.

HOW GENERAL EDUCATION COMPLETES OUR PHILOSOPHY OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

SETTING THE STAGE

General Education has experienced rising and falling over several decades as a particular kind of curriculum in higher education. As a quick introduction to the nature of general education, it is a viewpoint that certain parts of the curriculum, drawing on several disciplines in a coherent manner, should be required of all students as necessary for self-understanding and effective citizenship. The commitment of the higher education community to general education began to erode in the 1960's. Alvin P. Sanoff indicates that the demise of general education stems primarily from faculty preoccupation with their special disciplines instead of building bridges between disciplines. Uninterested in teaching general education courses...and under pressure from rebellious students, faculty replaced stiff requirements of general education curricula with virtually meaningless standards that could be met by almost any course. "As a consequence, general education became hollow to its core."[29] Sanoff attributes part of the renewed interest in general education to a report from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching which bemoaned the fact that "faculty and student preference now seems to move toward specialization and atomization of the curriculum and away from integration and coherence." [30]

Ernest L. Boyer's and Martin Kaplan's book, Educating For Survival, is also a rallying point for the establishment of a required core curriculum, based more on external realities of society. The authors say that our social and cultural condition calls for a new core curriculum. Part of this condition, the authors observe, is that the diversity and individual liberty in our society have gone beyond the desired healthy tension; "today the broadening vision seems in full retreat. The human agenda that we all confront is global; the issues are transcendent."[31] The authors then focus on individualism,

> Yet social structures are beginning to break apart, and humans tend increasingly to isolate themselves. Self, privatism, 'your own thing' are the new ruling tides.[32]

The privatism which Brown benignly predicted as a growing characteristic of student life, is seen here as the bane of a healthy society. Boyer and Kaplan make a further statement that places the right perspective on our assumptions about student freedom and individualism:

> Clearly, students must be free to follow their own interests, to develop their own aptitudes, and to pursue their own goals. On this liberty no one must trespass; this is why colleges have academic majors and electives. But the pursuit of individual preferences is not sufficient. Truly educated persons move beyond themselves, gain social perspective, see themselves in relation to other people and times, understand how their origins and wants and needs are tied to the origins and wants and needs of others. Such perspectives are central to the academic quest.[33]

The premises on which Boyer and Kaplan would establish a core curriculum are that, "We all inherit the past. We all confront the challenges of the present. We all participate in the making of the future, and we all make value choices."[34]

I realize that I have not yet defined what general education is, but I want to introduce the current societal need for such a curriculum, the essence of which is an enlightened humanism. Another writer who adds to the stage setting is Martin Kaplan in a Change magazine article entitled, "The Ideologies of 'Tough Times'", written in 1976.[35] Kaplan's insight on the nature of the American character over the past two decades is very poignant; his critique of higher education's relevance raises important issues, many solutions to which he and Boyer presented in the core curriculum approach in Educating For Survival. Kaplan characterizes the student culture of the seventies. Instead of the doubt and probing inquiry of the earlier activist generation, "they have chosen the rewards

of privatism, self-fulfillment, personal gratification, individualistic autonomy, and the burgherly hearthside virtues of coping, acquiescence, and accommodation."[36] They have chosen "cynical relativism", Kaplan continues, as the shrewdest strategy for operating within our premised economy. For this generation of students, Kaplan offers the following challenge to those who teach in higher education:

> Perhaps we need more techniques for worrying our students. We could use more ways to interrupt the unimpeded flow of fact from us to them, more ways to intervene and meddle in their moral lives, more ways to focus their attention on some questions that education seems recently to have forgotten--questions like, Who am I? and, Where do I want to go? and, What do I believe? [37]

Some reported new trends may be countering this observation of our generation of students. The April, 1981 issue of Psychology Today contained a cover article entitled, "Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down," a preview of a new book by Daniel Yankelovich. The author provides a vast array of data from studies and his commentary, two sections most pertinent to this presentation being titled, "Goodbye to the Inner Journey" and "Toward an Ethic of Commitment". (Please note how we in the social sciences can never get away from a basic attitude of process; our articles always speak of things that are either "emerging" or things going "toward". We are in perpetual flux!) A major point by Yankelovich, contrary to Kaplan's earlier predictions, is that the end of our affluent economy and new economic constraints mean the end of the freedoms and options that supported our sybaritic strivings for perfection and fulfillment. The author sees the new economic realities causing us to look outward to deeper meanings and commitments, the priorities that Frankl set for us earlier in this presentation. In a comment that further sets the stage for enlightened humanism of the general education curriculum, Yankelovick says,

> The self, as we are now beginning to see, is embedded in the culture and economy. It does not stand apart from them, making choices in a vacuum. For those who can see their lives not merely as private dramas contained within their own skin but as parts of a larger cultural/historical/economic episode, the meaning of self-fulfillment will wear a different aspect. [38]

A much broader analysis of our culture turned upside down appeared in a current issue of Time magazine at about the same time as the Yankelovich article. The "special project" report on American Renewal[39] covers many aspects of American society and its current mood in hard times. Much of the writing relates

to a national recovery from individual self-indulgence, moral relativism, and loss of national ideals. I quote a representative excerpt from the section entitled, "To Revive Responsibility",

> The 1980's may witness, for example, a long-overdue transition from an emphasis on feeling--'If it feels good, do it!'--to a keener focus on thought; feelings, at least the transcendent obliterations accomplished with drugs or extravagant sexual experiments, do not solve problems.[40]

GENERAL EDUCATION FOR HUMAN FULFILLMENT

We have seen the inadequacies of romantic humanism and how its popular form of individualism has been detrimental to human community. Student development philosophy in our new cultural awakening needs the perspective of enlightened humanism. In this approach to humanism, self-fulfillment is part of human fulfillment,

> To be fully human is not to live restricted to one dimension of space or time. The humanity of man is increased by education that brings about a comprehension and an appreciation of thoughts, feelings, and ideals of man in all ages. This historical cosmopolite is the truly civilized man. A civilized man is the complete human being.[41]

Philip Phenix, in his book Realms of Meaning, provides a view of the desirable scope, content and arrangment of studies derived for general education from fundamental considerations about human nature and knowledge. Phenix states that human beings are essentially creatures who have the power to experience MEANING. "Distinctively human existence consists in a pattern of meanings. Furthermore, GENERAL EDUCATION IS THE PROCESS OF ENGENDERING MEANINGS."[42] In a rebuttal of Rousseau, Dewey, and the organic view of fulfillment, Phenix states,

> The meanings that constitute the proper content of human experience do not appear automatically by a process of natural growth and development. The singular quality of human life is a product of deliberate nurture. It is not a gift of nature; it is a creation of culture. This is another way of saying that meaningful human life is necessarily social. It is only through the educative power of human community that genuine persons are brought into being.

A human being is in essence a creature who creates, discovers, enjoys, perceives, and acts on meanings. In describing the particular realms of meaning, Phenix says,

> A complete person should be skilled in the use of speech, symbol and gesture (symbolics), factually well-informed (empirics), capable of creating and appreciating objects of aesthetic significance (aesthetics), endowed with a rich and disciplined life in relation to self and others (synoetics), able to make wise decisions and to judge between right and wrong (ethics), and possessed of an integral outlook (synoptics).[44]

Phenix shows a keen cultural insight in relating his realms of meaning and proposed curriculum to the human condition in "modern industrial civilization", writing in 1964. He also shows a prophetic wisdom as his analysis foreshadows a culmination of these factors in current cultural analyses cited earlier. The perennial threats to meaning which Phenix cites in his time are: the spirit of criticism, part of our scientific heritage, but bringing all meanings into question; pervasive depersonalization and fragmentation of life; rapid change in the conditions of life, resulting in feelings of impermanence and insecurity. The curriculum which provides these competencies that satisfy the essential human need for meaning include instruction in language, mathematics, science, art, personal relations, morals, history, religion and philosophy.

All of these competencies are part of the humanities curriculum, except for mathematics, science and personal relations (depending on a more precise meaning of that category). The humanities are, I believe, the primary focus of general education and enlightened humanism. The recent report of the Rockefeller Commission on the Humanities urgently calls for improved quality of and increased emphasis on the humanities, stressing almost the same ills of society mentioned by Phenix and Yankelovich. In a poignant excerpt that relates to the human need for meaning, the report says, "They (the humanities) reveal how people have tried to make moral, spiritual, and intellectual sense of a world in which irrationality, despair, loneliness, and death are as conspicuous as birth, friendship, hope and reason."

FOOTNOTES

[1] G.L. Saddlemire, "Professional Developments," Student Services, ed. U.Delworth, G.R. Hanson et al (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, P. 25.

[2] Ibid., p. 29.

[3] Ibid., p. 38.

[4] Ibid., p. 31.

[5] Ibid.

[6] R.L. Morrill, Teaching Values in College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 17.

[7] T.K. Miller and J.S. Prince, The Future of Student Affairs (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 5.

[8] Ibid., p. 24.

[9] Ibid., p. 51.

[10] Ibid.

[11] W. Kilpatrick, Identity and Intimacy (New York: Dell, 1975), p. 45.

[12] Ibid., p. 46.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., p. 49.

[15] Miller, Prince, p. 1.

[16] Miller, Prince, p. 9.

[17] Miller, Prince, p. 25.

[18] Kilpatrick, p. 50.

[19] Kilpatrick, p. 52.

[20] R.D. Brown, Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return To The Academy (Washington: American College Personnel Association, 1972), Student Personnel Series No. 16, p. 15.

[21] R.F. Davidson, Philosophies Men Live By (New York: Dryden Press, 1952), p. 21.

[22] Ibid., p. 289.

[23] M.R. Raines, "A Life-Centered Student Affairs Program," NASPA Journal, Vol. XV, No. 1 (Summer, 1977).

[24] Ibid., pp. 5-7.

[25] Ibid., p. 7.

[26] Ibid., p. 8.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid., p. 9.

[29] A.P. Sanoff, "Reaffirming Intellectual Standards," Educational Record, Vol. LXI, No. 2 (Spring, 1980).

[30] Ibid., p. 12.

[31] E.L. Boyer and M. Kaplan, Educating For Survival (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1977), p. 56.

[32] Ibid., p. 56.

[33] Ibid., p. 58.

[34] Ibid., p. 62.

[35] M. Kaplan, "The Ideologies of Tough Times," Change, Vol. VIII, No. 7 (August, 1976).

[36] Ibid., p. 29.

[37] Ibid., p. 31.

[38] D. Yankelovich, "New Rules in American Life: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down," Psychology Today, Vol. XV, No. 4 (April, 1981), p. 38.

[39] Time, February 23, 1981, Vol. CXVII, No. 8.

[40] Ibid., p. 72.

[41] R.F. Davidson, The Humanities in General Education (Iowa, W.C. Brown, 1960), p. 5.

[42] P.H. Phenix, Realms of Meaning (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 5.

[43] Ibid., p. 30.

[44] Ibid., pp. 8 and 30.